UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,114	01/03/2005	Hugues Gabriel	0518-1083-1	9443

466   7590   10/22/2009
YOUNG & THOMPSON
209 Madison Street
Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER
SMITH, GARRETT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/22/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/520,114	GABRIEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Garrett Smith	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 May 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>13-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>13-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is regarding Applicant's response filed 26 May 2009 to a prior

Office Action. Claims 13 – 32 are pending. Claims 13 – 17 and 20 are amended.

Claims 29 – 32 are new.

2.   This Office Action is the **Fourth Action, Final Rejection**.

Response to Arguments

35 USC § 101

3.   Applicant's arguments (page 15 – 17) and amendments, filed 26 May 2009,

regarding the rejection under 35 USC § 101 of claims 13 – 28 have been fully

considered and are persuasive. For these reasons, the rejection under 35 USC § 101

of claims 13 – 28 is **<u>withdrawn</u>**.

35 USC § 103(a)

4.   Applicant's arguments (page 17 – 20) and amendments, filed 26 May 2009,

regarding the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) of claims 13 – 28 have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive.

        The Examiner notes Applicant's amendments to the claims as well as new claims

29 – 32. The Examiner has provided updated objections, rejections and claim

mappings below.

        Applicant argues that the cited references fails to teach returning stored rules

based on a priority of the selected market pair. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The priority of a particular "market pair" can simply be whether a user wishes to use that route (market pair) or not. Faltings provides for itinerary selection by a user. This is all that is required by the claim language.

In regard to Applicant's transversal of the knowledge possessed by a person of ordinary skill in the art, the transversal is inadequate. MPEP 2144.03(c),

> To adequately traverse such a finding, an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. See 37 CFR 1.111(b).

The Examiner notes that Appellant has not specifically and clearly pointed out the deficiencies of the knowledge possessed by a person of ordinary skill in the art and why it would not be in the common body of knowledge. Applicant states that "Applicants are not aware of a group of geographic names being used in the manner disclosed and recited." The Examiner notes that Office Notice was not take for the <u>use</u> of the specific geographic zones but for the specific geographic zones themselves. As Applicant has not contested that this subject matter is in the knowledge possessed by a person of ordinary skill in the art, the subject matter is now Applicant Admitted Prior Art.

For these reasons, the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) of claims 13 – 28 is **maintained**.

Claim Objections

5.   Claims **13** objected to because of the following informalities. Appropriate correction is required.

6.   In regard to **claim 13**, in the accessing step, the claim recites "the computerized

travel reservation". This phrase appears to be missing the word "system". Further, the

claim recites "the priority rank associated the geographic zone type of the destination

market of the select market pair" which is missing a "with" and should recite "the priority

rank associated with the geographic zone type of the destination market of the select

market pair".

7.   In regard to **claim 20**, in the searching step (and other amended locations), the

claim recites "the computerized travel reservation". This phrase appears to be missing

the word "system".

8.   In regard to **claims 29 and 30**, the term "plural" is used. However, this appears

to be grammatically incorrect. The Examiner suggests using "multiple" or "a plurality of"

to improve clarity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

10.   Claims **1 – 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the

steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: "receiving a request for a flight

search". Both claims 1 and 29 are missing this essential step in order for the method to

completely operate. The Examiner further notes that for purposes of examination the

step will be assumed to exist. Further, it is noted that without this step a 35 USC 101

rejection would have been given for these claims. However, as this step is interpreted

in light of this rejection, a 35 USC 101 rejection will not be made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13.   Claims **13, 18, 22 – 26 and 28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Faltings et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0033164, hereafter

"Faltings") in view Mogler et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0110062, hereafter

"Mogler").

14.   In regard to **claim 13**, Faltings teaches a method for storing and accessing data

in databases of a computerized travel reservation system, comprising the steps of:

Creating and storing rules (*see travel segments and constraint are the rules, in paragraph [0033] and [0034]; travel information database stores all the travel segments and constraints, in paragraph [0027]*) for accessing database data in a database system of a computerized travel reservation system, the data being service information applicable to flights (*intended use recitation and thus has no patentable weight*),

each rule comprising a criteria section containing at least one criterion (see selection of trip in Fig. 3 item#46) used for definition of the flights to which the rule is applicable (*intended use recitation and thus has no patentable weight*), and a content section containing data (*see constraint refers to the data value of travel itinerary, in paragraph [0034]*) corresponding to a type of service information applicable said applicable flight,

the at least one criterion in each rule being a market pair (*see origin and destination airport, in paragraph [0033]*), the market pair comprising i) an origin market defining a geographic zone of departure of the flight and ii) a destination market defining a geographic zone of arrival of the flight (*see geographical representation of origin and destination market, in Fig. 3 item#48*);

wherein the origin market and the destination market each correspond to at least one geographic zone type from the group consisting of an airport geographic zone type, a city geographic zone type, a state and country geographic zone type, a country geographic zone type, a geographic region geographic zone type, and a world geographic zone type (*see geographical representation of origin and destination market, in Fig. 3 item#48; the Examiner further notes that only one type of zone is required*);

Storing the created rules in a database on a computer readable medium (*see travel information database stores all the travel segments and constraints, in paragraph [0027]*); and

The computerized travel reservation system accessing the content of the stored rules in response to a request for a flight search pertaining to a selected market pair, and returning one of the stored rules based on a priority of the selected market pair as indicated by the priority rank associated with the geographic zone type of the origin market and the priority rank associated with the geographic zone type of the destination market of the select market pair (*see identify itineraries by accessing a travel information database, in paragraph [0040]*).

Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not disclose creating a table of geographical zone types and a priority rank associating with each geographical zone type, the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type. Mogler discloses creating a table of geographical zone types and a priority rank associating with each geographical zone type, the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type (*see priority rank associated with city code, in Fig. 4 item#312*). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine priority rank of Mogler with Faltings because it would help to get an optimal solution (*see paragraph [0010] of Mogler*).

15.   In regard to **claim 18**, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data
in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not
disclose additional criteria used for selection of a trip; and assigning, to each of the
additional criterion, a value corresponding to a weight based on a degree of importance
of each additional criterion, wherein, a total weight of each rule is a total of the weights
assigned to the additional criteria. Mogler disclose additional criteria used for selection
of a trip; and assigning, to each of the additional criterion, a value corresponding to a
weight based on a degree of importance of each additional criterion, wherein, a total
weight of each rule is a total of the weights assigned to the additional criteria (see an
additional criterion target share is assigned, in Fig. 4 item#310). It would have been
obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to
combine an additional criterion of Mogler with Faltings because it would help to get
optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

16.   In regard to claims **22 – 26 and 28**, these claim recite specific "service
information". The "service information" is accorded no patentable weight because it is
content. See arguments provided in the arguments section.

17.   Claims **14, 15 and 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Faltings et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0033164, hereafter "Faltings") in view
Mogler et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0110062, hereafter "Mogler") and further in
view of Official Notice.

18.   In regard to **claim 14**, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data

in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not

disclose created table includes at least i) the airport geographic zone type with a first

priority rank, ii) the city geographic zone type with a second priority rank greater than

the first priority rank, iii) the country geographic zone type with a third priority rank

greater than the second priority rank, and iv) the geographic region geographic zone

type with a fourth priority rank greater than the third priority rank. Mogler discloses

using of priority ranks for different elements (see priority rank is different for different

city, in Fig. 4 item#312). Neither Faltings nor Mogler explicitly discloses all four types

(airport, city, country, region). The only type explicitly recited is the city type by Mogler

in Figure 4. However, the Examiner submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of invention would recognize how to place addition zone types into a table and

thus takes Official Notice for this subject matter. Adding various zone types into a table

is a trivial activity for a person of ordinary skill because it only requires basic database

techniques (or even a ruler, a pencil and a sheet of paper to draw the table and fill out

the rows and columns). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of invention to use various zone types with that of Faltings and

Mogler because a table with various zone types with associated priorities can be used

to facilitate operations regarding other tables such as the operations of sorting or

searching based on priority).

19.   In regard to **claim 15**, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data

in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not

explicitly disclose the origin market is a first geographical zone type and the destination
market is a different, second geographical zone type. Mogler discloses the origin
market is a city and the destination market is a different city (see priority rank is different
for different city, in Fig. 4 item#312). Thus, Modger teaches that the two markets can
be different. As shown by the discussion of claim 14, neither Faltings nor Mogler
explicitly discloses multiple zone types. However, the Examiner submits that having
different geographical zone types would have been well known to a person of ordinary
skill in the art and would have been trivial to implement. The specific zones (airport,
city, country, geographic region) are well known in the art as criteria to be used in
limiting searches. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the
art at the time of invention to use various zone types with that of Faltings and Mogler
because a table with various zone types with associated priorities can be used to
facilitate operations regarding other tables such as the operations of sorting or
searching based on priority).

20.   In regard to **claim 27**, "the service information, applicable to the flights within the
creating rules for accessing database data, is the numbers of the loading terminals for
the applicable flights so that loading terminals are determinable, via the defined market
pair, for flights between the origin market and the destination market of the defined
market pair" is considered to be content and thus has no patentable weight (*see
arguments provided in the Arguments section*).

21.   Claims **16, 17 and 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Faltings et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0033164, hereafter "Faltings") in view

Mogler et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0110062, hereafter "Mogler") and further in

view of Official Notice.

22.   In regard to **claim 16**, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data

in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not

disclose calculating a priority of each market pair by i) assigning a first priority value to

the origin market based on the priority rank associated with the geographical zone type

of the origin market, ii) assigning a second priority value to the destination market based

on the priority rank associated with the geographical zone type of the destination

market, and iii) combining the first priority and the second priority. Mogler teaches

assigning priority values to the origin and destination markets (paragraph [0041]).

However, both Moger and Faltings are silent as to "combining" the two priorities. The

Examiner notes that "combining" is extremely broad in that it can be any of many

mathematical operations including (but not limited to) addition, subtraction etc. Another

operation used in mathematics is the concept of significant figures. "Significant figures"

is a measure of precision of a particular value. Thus, in multiplication when there are

unequal numbers of significant figures, the least number of significant figures are

selected. For example, a first number 1.03 has 3 significant figures and a second

number 1.0 has 2 significant figures. If these numbers are added (or another

mathematical operation) together, the result would be a number with 2 significant

figures. The same concept can be applied with priorities. If there is a first priority and a

second priority with the second being more significant than the first, the first priority can

be selected. The Examiner takes Official Notice of the concept of significant figures.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention to include the concept of significant figures with the priority determinations of

Mogler with Faltings because significant figures allows of a systematic and accepted

way for determination of the priority of the total element in a fast and efficient manner.

23.   In regard to **claim 17**, Faltings and Mogler disclose a method for storing and

accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. Mogler

discloses using of priority ranks for different elements (see priority rank is different for

different city, in Fig. 4 item#312). The type explicitly recited is the city type by Mogler in

Figure 4. However, the Examiner submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of invention would recognize how to place addition zone types into a table and thus

takes Official Notice for this subject matter. Adding various zone types into a table is a

trivial activity for a person of ordinary skill because it only requires basic database

techniques (or even a ruler, a pencil and a sheet of paper to draw the table and fill out

the rows and columns). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of invention to use various zone types with that of Faltings and

Mogler because a table with various zone types with associated priorities can be used

to facilitate operations regarding other tables such as the operations of sorting or

searching based on priority). Mogler teaches assigning priority values to the origin and

destination markets (paragraph [0041]). However, both Moger and Faltings are silent as

to "combining" the two priorites. The Examiner notes that "combining" is extremely

broad in that it can be any of many mathematical operations including (but not limited to) addition, subtraction etc. Another operation used in mathematics is the concept of significant figures. "Significant figures" is a measure of precision of a particular value. Thus, in multiplication when there are unequal numbers of significant figures, the least number of significant figures are selected. For example, a first number 1.03 has 3 significant figures and a second number 1.0 has 2 significant figures. If these numbers are added (or another mathematical operation) together, the result would be a number with 2 significant figures. The same concept can be applied with priorities. If there is a first priority and a second priority with the second being more significant than the first, the first priority can be selected. The Examiner takes Official Notice of the concept of significant figures. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to include the concept of significant figures with the priority determinations of Mogler with Faltings because significant figures allows of a systematic and accepted way for determination of the priority of the total element in a fast and efficient manner.

24.   In regard to **claim 19**, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not disclose the first criteria section for at least some of the rules, additional criteria used for selection of a trip; and assigning, to each of the additional criterion, a value corresponding to a weight based on a degree of importance of each additional criterion, wherein, a total weight of each rule is a total of the weights assigned to the additional criteria. Mogler disclose the first criteria section for at least some of the rules, additional

criteria used for selection of a trip; and assigning, to each of the additional criterion, a

value corresponding to a weight based on a degree of importance of each additional

criterion, wherein, a total weight of each rule is a total of the weights assigned to the

additional criteria (see weight is assigned to the additional criterion, in Fig. 4 item#310).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine assigning weight to the additional criterion of Mogler

with Faltings because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of

Mogler).

25.   Claims **20 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Faltings et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0033164, hereafter "Faltings") in view

Mogler et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0110062, hereafter "Mogler"), in view of

Official Notice and further in view of Winter et al (US Patent Application 2001/0007088,

hereafter "Winter").

26.   In regard to **claim 20**, Faltings and Mogler disclose creating a reservation

request by entering a origin market and a destination market as part of a trip search;

searching the stored rules to find rules with market pairs agreeing with both the origin

market and the destination market entered for the reservation request; for the rules

found to having market pairs agreeing with both the origin market and the destination

market, for each rule, computing the priority value of each market pair by i) assigning a

priority value to the origin market based on the priority rank associated with each

geographical zone type of the origin market, ii) assigning a second priority value to the

destination market based on the priority rank associated with each geographical zone

type of the destination market. However Faltings and Mogler do not disclose combining
the priority values of the origin market with the priority values of the destination market
to define the computer priority value of the market pair of the rule; and responsive to the
trip search, returning the content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest
computed priority value. Winter disclose combining the priority values of the origin
market with the priority values of the destination market to define the computer priority
value of the market pair of the rule; and responsive to the trip search, returning the
content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest computed priority value (see
combining priority values of more the one cities, in paragraph [0060] and finding the
lowest priority value, in paragraph [0062]). It would have been obvious to one having
ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine priority values of
different cities of Winter with Faltings and Mogler because it would help to get optimal
solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

27.   In regard to **claim 21**, Faltings and Mogler disclose a method for storing and
accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However
Faltings and Mogler do not disclose returning the content of the rule having the market
pair with the lowest computed priority value, of two rules having the same lowest
computed priority value, returning the content of the rule having the origin market with
the lowest priority value. Winter disclose returning the content of the rule having the
market pair with the lowest computed priority value, of two rules having the same lowest
computed priority value, returning the content of the rule having the origin market with
the lowest priority value (see principal minimization applies if two priority values are the

same, in paragraph [0062]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to principal minimization of Winter with

Faltings and Mogler because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010]

of Mogler).

28.   Claims **29 – 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Faltings et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0033164, hereafter "Faltings") in view Mogler

et al. (US Patent Application 2003/0110062, hereafter "Mogler"), in view of Official

Notice and further in view of Winter et al (US Patent Application 2001/0007088,

hereafter "Winter").

29.   In regard to **claim 29**, Faltings et al. teaches a method for storing and accessing

data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system, comprising the steps of:

Defining market pairs for storage in the database system of the computerized

travel reservation system (*see origin and destination airport, in paragraph [0033]*),

wherein each market pair comprises i) an origin market defining a

geographic zone of departure of flights and ii) a destination market defining a

geographic zone of arrival of the flights (*see geographical representation of origin

and destination market, in Fig. 3 item#48*),

storing flight trip rules in a database system of a computerized travel reservation,

each rule comprising i) a set of criteria defining a flight to which the rule applies, the set

of criteria comprising one of the market pairs and additional selection criteria concerning

service information applicable to the applicable flight, and ii) a content representing a

weight value of the criteria defining the flight (*see travel segments and constraint are the rules, in paragraph [0033] and [0034]; travel information database stores all the travel segments and constraints, in paragraph [0027]*);

wherein a weight is assigned to each additional criteria in the set of criteria of each trip information, the weight assigned to each additional criteria defining a degree of importance of each additional criteria (*outside claim scope, thus this limitation has no patentable weight*),

wherein the content representing the weight value of the criteria defining the flight is determined from the priority of each market pair and the weight of each additional criteria of the trip information (*outside claim scope, thus this limitation has no patentable weight*); and

the computerized travel reservation system responding to a trip search comprised of first origin market and a first destination market, by

i) accessing a flight trip rule by searching the stored market pairs of the stored trip information for plural market pairs agreeing with the first origin market and the first destination market (*see identify itineraries by accessing a travel information database, in paragraph [0040]*),

Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not disclose creating a table of geographical zone types and a priority rank associating with each geographical zone type, the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type. Mogler discloses

creating a table of geographical zone types and a priority rank associating with each

geographical zone type, the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type

decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type (*see*

priority rank associated with city code, in Fig. 4 item#312). It would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine

priority rank of Mogler with Faltings because it would help to get an optimal solution

(*see paragraph [0010] of Mogler*).

  Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a

computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not disclose calculating

a priority of each market pair by i) assigning a first priority value to the origin market

based on the priority rank associated with the geographical zone type of the origin

market, ii) assigning a second priority value to the destination market based on the

priority rank associated with the geographical zone type of the destination market, and

iii) combining the first priority and the second priority. Mogler teaches assigning priority

values to the origin and destination markets (paragraph [0041]). However, both Moger

and Faltings are silent as to "combining" the two priorities. The Examiner notes that

"combining" is extremely broad in that it can be any of many mathematical operations

including (but not limited to) addition, subtraction etc. Another operation used in

mathematics is the concept of significant figures. "Significant figures" is a measure of

precision of a particular value. Thus, in multiplication when there are unequal numbers

of significant figures, the least number of significant figures are selected. For example,

a first number 1.03 has 3 significant figures and a second number 1.0 has 2 significant

figures. If these numbers are added (or another mathematical operation) together, the result would be a number with 2 significant figures. The same concept can be applied with priorities. If there is a first priority and a second priority with the second being more significant than the first, the first priority can be selected. The Examiner takes Official Notice of the concept of significant figures. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to include the concept of significant figures with the priority determinations of Mogler with Faltings because significant figures allows of a systematic and accepted way for determination of the priority of the total element in a fast and efficient manner.

Faltings and Mogler disclose a method for storing and accessing data in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings and Mogler do not disclose returning the content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest computed priority value, of two rules having the same lowest computed priority value, returning the content of the rule having the origin market with the lowest priority value. Winter disclose returning the content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest computed priority value, of two rules having the same lowest computed priority value, returning the content of the rule having the origin market with the lowest priority value (see principal minimization applies if two priority values are the same, in paragraph [0062]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to principal minimization of Winter with Faltings and Mogler because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

Faltings and Mogler disclose creating a reservation request by entering a origin market and a destination market as part of a trip search; searching the stored rules to find rules with market pairs agreeing with both the origin market and the destination market entered for the reservation request; for the rules found to having market pairs agreeing with both the origin market and the destination market, for each rule, computing the priority value of each market pair by i) assigning a priority value to the origin market based on the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type of the origin market, ii) assigning a second priority value to the destination market based on the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type of the destination market. However Faltings and Mogler do not disclose combining the priority values of the origin market with the priority values of the destination market to define the computer priority value of the market pair of the rule; and responsive to the trip search, returning the content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest computed priority value. Winter disclose combining the priority values of the origin market with the priority values of the destination market to define the computer priority value of the market pair of the rule; and responsive to the trip search, returning the content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest computed priority value (see combining priority values of more the one cities, in paragraph [0060] and finding the lowest priority value, in paragraph [0062]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine priority values of different cities of Winter with Faltings and Mogler because it would help to get optimal solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

30.   In regard to **claim 30**, Faltings discloses a method for storing and accessing data

in databases of a computerized travel reservation system. However Faltings does not

disclose created table includes at least i) the airport geographic zone type with a first

priority rank, ii) the city geographic zone type with a second priority rank greater than

the first priority rank, iii) the country geographic zone type with a third priority rank

greater than the second priority rank, and iv) the geographic region geographic zone

type with a fourth priority rank greater than the third priority rank. Mogler discloses

using of priority ranks for different elements (see priority rank is different for different

city, in Fig. 4 item#312). Neither Faltings nor Mogler explicitly discloses all four types

(airport, city, country, region). The only type explicitly recited is the city type by Mogler

in Figure 4. However, the Examiner submits that a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of invention would recognize how to place addition zone types into a table and

thus takes Official Notice for this subject matter. Adding various zone types into a table

is a trivial activity for a person of ordinary skill because it only requires basic database

techniques (or even a ruler, a pencil and a sheet of paper to draw the table and fill out

the rows and columns). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill

in the art at the time of invention to use various zone types with that of Faltings and

Mogler because a table with various zone types with associated priorities can be used

to facilitate operations regarding other tables such as the operations of sorting or

searching based on priority).

31.   In regard to **claim 31**, Faltings and Mogler disclose creating a reservation

request by entering a origin market and a destination market as part of a trip search;

searching the stored rules to find rules with market pairs agreeing with both the origin

market and the destination market entered for the reservation request; for the rules

found to having market pairs agreeing with both the origin market and the destination

market, for each rule, computing the priority value of each market pair by i) assigning a

priority value to the origin market based on the priority rank associated with each

geographical zone type of the origin market, ii) assigning a second priority value to the

destination market based on the priority rank associated with each geographical zone

type of the destination market. However Faltings and Mogler do not disclose combining

the priority values of the origin market with the priority values of the destination market

to define the computer priority value of the market pair of the rule; and responsive to the

trip search, returning the content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest

computed priority value. Winter disclose combining the priority values of the origin

market with the priority values of the destination market to define the computer priority

value of the market pair of the rule; and responsive to the trip search, returning the

content of the rule having the market pair with the lowest computed priority value (see

combining priority values of more the one cities, in paragraph [0060] and finding the

lowest priority value, in paragraph [0062]). It would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine priority values of

different cities of Winter with Faltings and Mogler because it would help to get optimal

solution (see paragraph [0010] of Mogler).

32.   In regard to **claim 32**, Faltings, Mogler and Winter disclose the method according

to claim 31, wherein, the computerized travel reservation system responds to the trip

search based on the content representing the weight value of the criteria defining the

flight (*outside claim scope, this limitation has no patentable weight*).

Conclusion

33.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Garrett Smith whose telephone number is (571)270-1764. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim T. Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

October 21, 2009   /GS/
                                                    Garrett Smith
                                                    Patent Examiner
                                                    Art Unit 2168

        /Tim T. Vo/
        Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2168